

from the Jaina lexicon. The parallel between the Jaina and the Buddhist paths was however noticed by one Jaina author, namely the celebrated Haribhadrasūri, the eighth century author of the *Yogabindu*. Haribhadra, rather boldly, asserts that the Jaina *samyagdrṣṭi* can be called a ‘bodhisattva’ as the former has ‘all the characteristics of the latter’: ‘Like the Bodhisattva (as held by the Buddhists), the *samyag-drṣṭi* also may never commit a volitionally inspired evil act, will aspire to do good to others, and will become endowed with the “supreme bodhi”, or attain to the status of a Tīrthaṅkara.’²⁰

ayam asyām avasthāyām bodhisattvo 'bhidhīyate,
anyais tal lakṣaṇam yasmāt sarvam asyopapadyate.
kāyapātina evehā bodhisattvāḥ paroditām,
na cittapātinas tāvad etad atrāpi yuktimat.
parārtharasiko dhīmān mārgagāmī mahāśayah,
guṇarāgī tathety ādi sarvam tulyaṁ dvayor api.
yat samyagdāśanam bodhis tat pradhāno mahodayah,
satvō 'stu bodhisattvas tadd hantaiṣo 'nvarthato pi hi.
varabodhisameto vā tīrthakrd yo bhavisyati,
tathā bhavyatvato 'sau vā bodhisattvāḥ satām mataḥ.

(The *Yogabindu* of Ācārya Haribhadrasūri, (ed. K.K. Dixit), Ahmedabad 1968, 270–74). Notwithstanding the similarities noted above, Haribhadra’s comments should not be taken literally. A bodhisattva is destined to be a Buddha whereas a *samyagdrṣṭi* may or may not become a Tīrthaṅkara; the fact that most of the *samyagdrṣṭis* end their careers as ordinary (i.e. non-Teacher) arhats, albeit with omniscience, underlines the basic difference between the two careers.

- 20 Compare, for example, the story of king Nandana (Mahāvīra’s soul in a previous birth) who renounced his kingdom, became a Jaina monk, practised severe austerities, attracted the *tīrthaṅkara-prakṛti*, and was reborn in the Prāṇata heaven. From there he was reborn, in his final incarnation, as Vardhamāna Mahāvīra. See *Trisaṭṭisalākā-purusacarita*, X, i, 217–84. As a matter of fact, the Jainas have made a rule that one must become a Tīrthaṅkara in the second birth after being ‘bound by’ the *tīrthaṅkara-prakṛti*: *pāraddhatitthayarabandhabhavādo tadiyabhavet titthayarasantakammiyajīvāṇam mokkhagamanāṇiyamādo* (Quoted in Jinendra Varni, *Jainendra-siddhāntakośa*, II, p. 371).
- 21 Although all the twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras of the present cycle have descended from heaven (as did Gautama from the Tuṣita heaven), the Jainas believe that certain souls may come from purgatories (*narakā*) and be born as Tīrthaṅkaras. King Śreṇika Bimbisāra of Magadha is said to fall in this category. He was a great devotee of Mahāvīra and had by his devotion attracted the *tīrthaṅkara-prakṛti*, but he committed suicide and was born in the first *narakā*. It is believed that he will be reborn as the first Tīrthaṅkara of the next kalpa. See *ibid.*, IV, p. 71.

FA-HSIEN AND BUDDHIST TEXTS IN CEYLON

In his *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon* (2nd ed., Colombo, 1953, pp. 94–5) E.W. Adikaram wrote: ‘When Fa Hien left Ceylon he took with him a copy of the Vinaya Piṭaka of the Mahīśāsaka School, the Dīrghāgama and the Samyuktāgama (sūtras) and also the Samyuktasañchaya-piṭaka, all written in Sanskrit.’ In a recent article K.R. Norman has pointed out that the word *fan*, as used by Fa-hsien himself, means ‘Indian (language)’ and that without further evidence there is no way of saying whether the language was Skt, Pkt, or Pali.¹ The only further evidence available is to be found in the Chinese translations of the Indian texts which Fa-hsien brought back to China.

The dates of the birth and death of Fa-hsien are not known; and although he himself wrote an account of his travels, their exact chronology cannot be established (Demiéville, 1953, pp. 402–3). According to his account he remained in Ceylon for two years (Legge, p. 111; Giles, 1923, p. 76), probably in the years 410–11. During his stay he obtained copies of the *Vinaya* of the *Mahīśāsakas*, the *Dīrghāgama*, the *Samyuktāgama* and the ‘Miscellaneous piṭaka’ (*tsa-tsang*, T.2085, p. 865c24–25).

Of these four texts the *Tsa-tsang* was translated by Fa-hsien himself (T.745). According to the oldest existing catalogue of Chinese translations, the *Ch'u san-tsang chi chi* (T.2145, p.12a2), compiled by Seng-yu († 518) at the beginning of the sixth century, the title is ‘Miscellaneous piṭaka sūtra’ (*tsa-tsang ching*). It is published under this title in the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon, but it is probable that *ching* is a later addition. It is not possible to know the Sanskrit title. Different Sanskrit titles have been reconstructed as *Samyuktasañcayapiṭaka* (Legge), *Samyukta-piṭaka* (Nanjo, no. 676; Kolmaš, p. 95) and *Kṣudrakasūtra* (*Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais*, Paris–Tōkyō, 1978, p. 72). *Tsa* is used to render both *saṃyukta* and *kṣudraka* and it is possible that this text is a part of a *Kṣudrakapiṭaka*.²

The *Tsa-tsang ching* occupies less than four pages in the Taishō edition (vol. 17, pp. 557b–560b). The first part tells how Maudgalyāyana sees five hundred pretas on the bank of the

Ganges. They ask him why they are undergoing such punishment. Seventeen pretas relate their sufferings and to each of them Maudgalyāyana explains which sins he has committed in his previous life. Thereupon Maudgalyāyana sees a *devakanyā* sitting on a lotus a hundred *yojanas* long and wide. She tells Maudgalyāyana that she was rewarded in this way for honouring a statue of Buddha Kāśyapa with flowers. The following story tells how a servant washes Śāriputra's clothes in the Mango park (Āmrapālīvana?). He dies the same night and is reborn in the heaven of the Thirty-three gods. Indra sees this, goes to Śāriputra and honours him with flowers. Śāriputra teaches him the dharma and Indra obtains the state of *srota-āpanna*. The next story concerns Maudgalyāyana. He sees a divine being whose body is immense. His hands are of golden colour and *amṛta* drips from his fingers. He tells Maudgalyāyana that he is a great divine being and resides in the capital of the kingdom. In his former life he was a poor woman in the same capital Lo-lou^(a) (*Lâ-ljiu*).³ A śramaṇa-brāhmaṇa who was begging for food asked her how to find the house of a certain rich *grhpati*. She warned him that noon had passed and that therefore he could no longer ask for food.

The second part of the *Tsa-tsang* tells the story of king Udayana of the kingdom of Avanti (?). The queen 'Light of the moon' (Candraprabhā?) enters the religious life and obtains the state of *anāgamin*. She dies in a village and is reborn in the *rūpadhātu* heaven. At night she appears before the king in the form of a *rāksasa* and explains that she is his former wife. She exhorts the king to enter the religious life. The king entrusts himself to Kātyāyana and enters the religious life. He goes to Rājagṛha and has a conversation with king Bimbisāra. He preaches the *dharma* to him and Bimbisāra departs. Then the text continues abruptly with a question about the merit of exercising for one day and night, or seven days or one's whole life, the three matters (*vastu*?) of a bodhisattva. The text does not explain who puts the question or who replies, the reply being that only the Buddha can answer this question. Then somebody tells the story of the king of the kingdom of the Yüeh-chih who wanted to build thirty-two stūpas. When the king had built thirty-one stūpas a bad man touched (insulted?) him. The king thought: 'How can this bad man be converted?' He gave up *samsāra* and directed himself

towards *nirvāṇa*. He built the thirty-second stūpa and became an arhat. The text continues: 'Therefore this monastery is called *Prātimokṣa* (a gloss adds: in Chinese 'giving up *samsāra*'). Since then not yet two hundred years have passed. This monastery still exists. I also saw it. In all monasteries there are beautiful statues'. The text continues by relating how, after the death of the king, a man obtained the fruit of a mango tree. He wondered how much merit could be obtained by offering the fruit to a statue of the Buddha Śākyamuni. He put this question to three different holy men, who declared themselves incapable of answering his question. He then went to the Tuṣita heaven and put this question to Maitreya, who told him to wait until he had become a Buddha. Here the text ends abruptly.

It is not possible to know whether the *Tsa-tsang* reproduces faithfully the manuscript brought back by Fa-hsien or if the Chinese translation has been badly preserved in China. The stories told by the seventeen pretas may have been part of a *Pretavastu* and this probably explains the title *Kṣudrakapitaka*. The story of king Udayana does not seem to occur elsewhere. The remaining part of the text is in a rather chaotic state, but the stories relating to the king of the Yüeh-chih kingdom and the visit to Maitreya are quite interesting. In any case, there is no reason to doubt that this text was brought back from Ceylon by Fa-hsien and translated by him.

The *Tsa-tsang* contains only very few transliterations. Since almost all of them were in common use in Chinese translations of the fourth and fifth centuries, it is not possible to determine the language of the manuscript itself.

The manuscript of the *Dīrghāgama* which was brought back by Fa-hsien was not translated. This was probably due to the fact that in 413 a translation of the *Dīrghāgama* of the Dharmaguptakas was published by Buddhayaśas, a monk from Kashmir (T. 1). Waldschmidt, Bailey and Brough have studied the Chinese transliterations found in this text and pointed out a number of agreements with the language of the Gāndhārī *Dharmapada*.⁴ Chinese sources do not give any information about the manuscript of the *Dīrghāgama* brought back by Fa-hsien. It probably belonged to another school, but apparently the Chinese did not see any need for yet another *Dīrghāgama* translation.

According to the *Kao-seng chuan* (Shih, p. 150) and the *Ch'u san-tsang chi chi* (T. 2145, p. 105c) the *Samyuktāgama* (T. 99) was one of the first texts translated by Guṇabhadra, a monk from Central India who arrived in Canton in 435. According to the *Li-tai san-pao chi*, a catalogue compiled by Fei Ch'ang-fang in 597, the manuscript translated by Guṇabhadra was brought back by Fa-hsien (T. 2034, p. 91a). Fei Ch'ang-fang's source is the *Sung Ch'i lu*, a catalogue of translations made during the Sung and Ch'i dynasties (420–502), which was compiled by Chih Tao-hui (451–481) shortly before his death.⁵ The *Li-tai san-pao chi* refers several times to this catalogue (e.g. pp. 85a, 85b, 89b, 89c, 91a, 95b and 95c) and there is no valid reason to doubt the information from it that is given by Fei Ch'ang-fang. The fact that the *Ch'u san-tsang chi chi* does not say that Guṇabhadra translated a manuscript brought back by Fa-hsien does not prove the untruthfulness of the *Sung Ch'i lu*.⁶ In a later article Demiéville wrote that the manuscript of the *Samyuktāgama* was brought back either by Fa-hsien or by Guṇabhadra himself (Demiéville, 1953, p. 418) but he made no mention of the reference to the *Sung Ch'i lu* (cf. n.5). However, even if the manuscript translated was not the one brought back by Fa-hsien, it is still possible that Guṇabhadra brought it back from Ceylon because his biography mentions that he visited Ceylon (Shih, p. 149).

The Chinese transliterations of Indian words in this version of the *Samyuktāgama* are undoubtedly based upon Sanskrit originals. It is of course not surprising to find in a translation dating from about 440 many transliterations which had been in common use for rendering well-known Indian names. However, it also contains many transliterations of less common names which are not to be found elsewhere. The following examples, to which many others could be added, clearly point to a Sanskrit original: *a-ch'i(g'y)-ni-ta(d'āt)-to(tā)(b)* = *Agnidatta* (p. 178a4); *a-t'i-mu(miuk)-ta(c)* = *atimukta(ka)* (p. 317a9); *a-li-sō(śiet)-cha(t'i)a(d)* = *Ariṣṭa* (p. 206b27); *an-chia(g'jia)-t'o(d'ā)(e)* = *Anigada* (p. 179c5); *i-shih(śīap)-po(puā)-lo(lā)(f)* = *Īśvara* (p. 236a23); *yū(juət)-ta(tā)-la-t'i(d'iāi)-she(śia)(g)* = *Uttaradesa* (p. 133b12); *chia(g'jia)-na-chia(g'jia)-mou(məu)-ni(h)* = *Kanakamuni* (p. 101b5); *shih(śi)-li-sha(śia)(i)* = *Śairīsaka* (p. 169b5); *mi-ch'ih(t'i)-lo(lā)(j)* = *Mithilā* (p. 317b20); *po(puā)-cha(t'i)a)-li-fu(pjuət)-ta-lo(lā)(k)* = *Pātaliputra* (p. 59b17).

In 1904 Pischel published several Sanskrit fragments of a manuscript of a *Samyuktāgama* and in the same year Sylvain Lévi showed that they corresponded to the Chinese translation of the *Samyuktāgama* by Guṇabhadra.⁷ Many other Sanskrit fragments of the *Samyuktāgama* have been published since, and in most cases a corresponding text has been found in Guṇabhadra's translation.⁸ Akanuma pointed out that the quotations from the *Samyuktāgama* in the *Mahāvibhāṣā*, the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, the *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* and other texts in general correspond to Guṇabhadra's version.⁹ As these works usually quote Sarvāstivāda texts, there is, according to Akanuma, not the slightest reason to doubt that the *Samyuktāgama* translated by Guṇabhadra belonged to the Sarvāstivādins. The school of the Sarvāstivādins was particularly strong in Central Asia and it is therefore not surprising to see that many fragments of Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Samyuktāgama* of the Sarvāstivādins were found in Central Asia.

Fa-hsien's manuscript of the *Mahīśāsakavinaya* was translated in 423–4 by Buddhajīva, a monk from Kashmir, Chih-sheng, a Khotanese śramaṇa, and two Chinese. Tao-sheng and Hui-yen (Shih, p. 119; T. 2145, p. 12b). Both the *Kao-seng chuan* and the *Ch'u san-tsang chi chi* (p. 21a) state clearly that Buddhajīva translated the manuscript brought back from Ceylon by Fa-hsien. There seems to be general agreement among scholars that the information given by these two works is correct.¹⁰ Several sections of the *Mahīśāsakavinaya* have been translated. Jean Przyluski translated the narrative of the Rājagṛha council and Marcel Hofinger that of the Vaisālī council. Jean Jaworski translated the sections on food and medicine.¹¹ Hofinger raised the question of whether the original had been written in Pāli, and Demiéville subsequently took up the problem (Demiéville, 1951, p. 293). It is necessary to quote the relevant passage in full: 'Un coup d'oeil sur ces transcriptions suffit: l'original du Vinaya des Mahīśāsaka, trouvé à Ceylan par Fa-hien en 410–412, et traduit après sa mort survenue en 420, n'était pas en pāli. On sait du reste que, dès la fin du IVe siècle, ce Vinaya était répandu au Cachemire, centre de sanskrit, car les biographies de son traducteur, Buddhajīva, qui était originaire du Cachemire, nous disent qu'il y avait eu pour maître en Vinaya, dans sa jeunesse, un moine de l'école Mahīśāsaka

(T. 2059, iii, 339a). Voici quelques transcriptions prises au hasard dans le fragment du Vinaya des Mahīśāsaka traduit par M. Hofinger: p. 23, Vaiśālī est transcrit P'i-chö-li, sur -s- et non -s-; p. 56, Kauśambī = Keou-chan-mi, où *chan* < *śiäm, p. 82, Śālha (pāli Sālha) = Cha-lan, où *cha* < *śa; p. 104, Kubjaśobhita (pāli Khujjasobhita) = Pou-tchö-tsong, transcription abrégée où *pou* est pour le -b- de *kubja*; Viśabha (pāli Vāsabha) = P'o-cha, avec § cérébral.' Demiéville does not say positively that the original was written in Sanskrit but his remarks on Kashmir as a centre of Sanskrit suggests that he assumed that this was the case. However, the fact that Buddhajīva came from Kashmir does not prove that the original must have been written in Sanskrit. Buddhayaśas, the translator of the *Dīrghāgama*, was also a Kashmirian but the original of this text was certainly not written in Sanskrit. Édouard Chavannes who translated seven stories from the *Mahīśāsakavinaya* drew attention to the fact that Chih-sheng, who translated the original (recited by Buddhajīva) into Chinese, was a śramaṇa from Khotan.¹² Sylvain Lévi remarked that the Theras, the Dharmaguptas and the Mahīśāsakas used Prakrit as their canonical language whereas the Sarvāstivādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins had a canon written in Sanskrit.¹³ However, as far as I know, Demiéville is the only scholar to have examined some of the transliterations used by the translators of the *Mahīśāsakavinaya*.

Of the five transliterations listed by Demiéville the first two were in common use. The remaining three (Śālha, Kubjaśobhita and Viśabha) are transliterations of names of monks who are mentioned in connection with the council in Vaiśālī. An account of this council is found not only in the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsakas but also in the Vinayas of the Sarvāstivādins, the Dharmaguptakas and the Mahāśāmghikas. All three of them were translated into Chinese before the translation of the *Mahīśāsakavinaya* was undertaken. In this respect it is especially necessary to pay attention to the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas because it is closely related to that of the Mahīśāsakas. The transliterations of these three names in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas are not exactly the same as those used in the *Mahīśāsakavinaya* but they are very similar (cf. Hofinger, p. 105: P'o-cheou-ts'uen, Cha-lieou and Pou-tchö-sou-mo). For instance, both Vinayas transliterate Kubja- in exactly the same way, both omitting the

syllable *ku*. Demiéville mentions another interesting example (1951, p. 290): to Pāli Sabbakāmī corresponds in the *Sarvāstivādavinaya* sa-p'o-chia-mo (Sarvakāma) but in the Vinayas of the Dharmaguptakas and the Mahīśāsakas we find i-ch'ieh-ch'ü (Sarvagāma or Sarvagāmin). Another example is the transliteration of the name of the Malla Roja (Roca in Sanskrit, cf. Edgerton's dictionary). Both Vinayas have Lu-i⁽¹⁾ (*luo-ži*),¹⁴ Skt. Roci (?), cf. T. 1421, p. 151c25; T. 1428, p. 873c17. However, in other instances different translations are found in both Vinayas. The Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas has po-po (pp. 861b7 and 873c13) which transliterates Skt. Pāpā (Pali Pāvā) but the *Mahīśāsakavinaya* uses the transliteration po-hsün^(m) (*puâ-ziuən*) which is already found in earlier Chinese translations.¹⁵ E. Mayeda listed the various translations and transliterations of the nine and twelve arñgas. According to his list the *Mahīśāsakavinaya* is the only text to transliterate *ityuktaka* with *yü(iuk)-to(tâ)-chia(g'jia)*⁽ⁿ⁾ which corresponds to *(it)yuktaka*. In the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas we find hsiang-ying ching,^(o) a translation of *(it)yuktaka*.¹⁶ In both Vinayas some transliterations are clearly based upon Sanskrit originals, others on Prakrit originals. For instance both Vinayas transliterate Viśabhū with *sui(zwie)-yeh/siäp/p*^(p) which corresponds to (z)Viṣyapa.¹⁷ Śy for śva is found also in other transliterations. In the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas the name Aśvajit is transliterated *a-shih/siäp-pi/pjie*.^(q) In the *Mahīśāsakavinaya* we find *ofât-pi/pjię*^(r) which is even more difficult to explain. The name of the nāgarāja Supassa (Mahāvagga VI.23.12) is translated in both Vinayas. The Dharmaguptakavinaaya has shan-hsien^(s) 'well-visible' which probably translated Supasya. The *Mahīśāsakavinaya* has shan-tzu-tsai^(t) which Jaworski renders with 'Bon-souverain'.¹⁸ However, tzu-tsai is also used to translate *vasitva*, etc. Probably shan-tzu-tsai corresponds to Skt. Suvaśya.

The transliterations used by the translators of the Vinayas of the Dharmaguptakas and the Mahīśāsakas do not allow us to draw a definite conclusion as to the language in which the originals were written. In the case of the Chinese translation of the *Samyuktagama* the picture is quite clear, but the situation is entirely different with regard to the two Vinayas. It will be necessary to undertake a much more thorough study of the transliterations

and translations of names in both Vinayas. Perhaps even then it will be difficult to determine the language in which their originals were written. One has to keep in mind the methods used in translating Indian texts. According to the *Kao-seng chuan* the *Mahīśāsakavinya* was translated by four persons: 'Buddhajīva tint le texte indien, un śramane khotanais Tche-cheng servit de traducteur; Tao-cheng du Long-kouang (sseu) et Houei-yen du Tong-ngan (sseu) y participèrent en tenant le pinceau et revisèrent (la traduction)' (Shih, p. 119). Buddhajīva undertook this translation four months after having arrived at Yang-chou. His knowledge of Chinese must have been practically nil. His task must have been to read aloud the text in its original wording. Chih-sheng then translated the text orally sentence by sentence and the two Chinese monks noted the translation and later revised it. The transliteration of names which were not well-known must have posed a particular problem. It is probable that in revising the translation other translations, especially those of Vinaya texts, were consulted. It is therefore always necessary to examine whether a certain transliteration or translation is found in previous translations or not. This has often been overlooked in the study of transliterations of Indian names in Chinese translations. A systematic and historical study of the transliterations used by different translators and in different periods is an urgent desideratum.

At the time of Fa-hsien it was difficult to find manuscripts of the Vinayas. According to Fa-hsien's account of his travels in Northern India the Vinayas were handed down orally from one Patriarch to another (Giles, p. 64). His main reason for going to Ceylon was probably to obtain a copy of the *Mahīśāsakavinya*. Indian Buddhist monks also visited Ceylon—for instance, Guṇavarman (367–431) left his native Kashmir and went to Ceylon shortly after his thirtieth birthday (Shih, p. 126)—while Ceylonese monks travelled to India and even to China. In the year 269 of an unspecified era the Ceylonese monk Mahānāman describes the disciples of Mahākāsyapa as *Samyuktāgamināḥ*.¹⁹ Sylvain Lévi remarked: 'Ainsi les disciples de Mahākāsyapa établis à Ceylan se réclament du *Samyuktāgama*; le trait n'est pas assez caractéristique pour préciser leur école: les *Mahāsāṃghika*, les *Sarvāstivādin*, les *MūlaSarvāstivādin* sont d'accord pour placer en tête des

Āgama le *Samyukta*, que les Sthavira classent seulement en troisième ligne. Il y a là toutefois un indice de plus pour nous empêcher de ranger sommairement Mahānāman parmi les *Theravādin*.' As mentioned above, it is quite probable that Fa-hsien obtained a copy of a manuscript of the *Samyuktāgama* of the Sarvāstivādins in Ceylon. Therefore the possibility is not excluded that Mahānāman belonged to the same school. In 434 Sarṇghavarman arrived in Nanking. His biography relates that about the same time T'ie-sa-lo (Tissalā?) and other Ceylonese nuns arrived in the Chinese capital and that Sarṇghavarman was appointed as their religious teacher (Shih, p. 138).²⁰ The Chinese sources show that in the first half of the fifth century contacts between Buddhist communities in India, Ceylon and China were very close. It is therefore quite probable that Buddhist texts composed in Sanskrit, Prakrit and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit were available in Ceylon and were brought from there to China.

CANBERRA

J. W. DE JONG

Notes

- 1 'The role of Pāli in early Sinhalese Buddhism', in Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*, Göttingen, 1978, p. 39. On the meaning of *fan* and *hu* see Shih, p. 173.
- 2 According to Sylvain Lévi *Tsa-tsang* corresponds to *Kṣudrakāgama*, cf. Sylvain Lévi and Édouard Chavannes, 'Les seize arhats protecteurs de la loi', *JA*, 1916 (II), p. 37, n. 1. However, Jean Przyluski has shown that in *Tsa-tsang tsang* renders *piṭaka*, cf. *Le concile de Rājagṛha*, Paris, 1926–8, p. 90. Et. Lamotte uses both *Kṣudrakāgama* and *Kṣudrakapiṭaka*, cf. *Histoire du Bouddhisme indien*, I, Louvain, 1958, pp. 174–5.
- 3 The reconstructed Ancient Chinese pronunciation given in parentheses is based on the works by Bernhard Karlgren: 'Pronunciation ancienne de caractères chinois figurant dans les transcriptions bouddhiques', *T'oung Pao*, 19, 1918–9, pp. 104–21; *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*, Paris, 1923; 'Grammata Serica. Script and Phonetics in Chinese and Sino-Japanese', *BMFEA*, 12, 1940, pp. 1–471; 'Grammata serica recens', *BMFEA*, 29, 1957, pp. 1–332.
- 4 Cf. John Brough, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London, 1962, pp. 50–4.
- 5 Cf. Paul Demiéville, 'Les versions chinoises du *Milindapañha*', *BEFEO*,

- 24, 1924, p. 11. On the *Sung Ch'i lu* see P. C. Bagchi, *Le canon bouddhique en Chine*, I, Paris, 1927, p. xxxviii.
- 6 Akanuma attributes too much importance to the argumentum ex silentio, cf. Akanuma Chizen, *Bukkyō kyōten shiron*, Nagoya, 1940, p. 51, n. 8.
- 7 Cf. Sylvain Lévi, 'Le Samyuktāgama sanscrit et les Feuillots Grünwedel', *T'oung Pao*, 5, 1904, pp. 297–309.
- 8 Cf. Yamada Ryūjō, *Bongo butten no shobunken*, Kyōto, 1959, pp. 33–9, 47 and 187.
- 9 *Op. cit.*, pp. 46–8: 'Zōagongyō' in Ono Gemmyō (ed.), *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten*, vol. 7, Tōkyō, 1934, pp. 61–2. Cf. also Ét. Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, III, Louvain, 1970, p. xv: 'L'étude comparée des textes montre que l'auteur du *Traité* utilisait le *Madhyāgama* et le *Samyuktāgama* dont les Taishō 26 et 99 sont la traduction.'
- 10 Cf. P. Demiéville, 1951, p. 293; Hirakawa Akira, *Ritsuzō no kenkyū*, Tōkyō, 1960, p. 142. In an article that I have not been able to consult Tachibana Shundō seems to have tried to prove that Buddhajīva's translation is not made from a manuscript brought back from Ceylon by Fa-hsien, cf. *Bibliographie bouddhique*, VII–VIII, Paris, 1937, p. 107, no. 357.
- 11 Jean Przyłuski, *Le concile de Rājagrha*, Paris, 1926–8, pp. 134–68; Marcel Hofinger, *Étude sur le concile de Vaisālī*, Louvain, 1946, pp. 22–124; Jean Jaworski, 'La section des Remèdes dans le Vinaya des Mahīśāsaka et dans le Vinaya pāli', *RO*, 5, 1928, pp. 92–101; 'La section de la Nourriture dans le Vinaya des Mahīśāsaka', *RO*, 7, 1931, pp. 53–124.
- 12 *Cinq cents contes et apologues*, II (Paris, 1911), p. 336, no. 1.
- 13 'Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques', *JA*, 1915(I), p. 446.
- 14 For *-i* = *ž* see H.W. Bailey, 'Gāndhārī', *BSOAS*, 11, 1946, p. 777.
- 15 Cf. P. Pelliot, 'Pāpiyān > Po-siun', *T'oung Pao*, 30, 1933, p. 91.
- 16 Mayeda Egaku, *Genshi bukkyō seitō no seiritsu-shi kenkyū*, Tōkyō, 1964, pp. 348 foll.
- 17 For *sui* (*zwię*) see P. Pelliot, *op. cit.*, pp. 95 foll.; H. W. Bailey, 'Hvatanička IV', *BSOAS*, 10, 1942, p. 909, n. 2.
- 18 *RO*, 7, 1931, p. 65.
- 19 'L'inscription de Mahānāman à Bodh-Gaya', *Indian Studies in honor of Ch. R. Lanman*, Cambridge, Mass., 1929, pp. 35–47 = *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi*, Paris, 1937, pp. 343–54.
- 20 It is quite possible that the nuns arrived with the official mission sent from Ceylon to China in the year 435. It is recorded in the Chinese histories that in the first half of the fifth century four such official missions from Ceylon arrived in China, cf. Sylvain Lévi, 'Les missions de Wang Hiuen-Ts'e dans l'Inde', *JA*, 1900 (I), pp. 411–15.

Bibliography

- Demiéville, P., 'A propos du concile de Vaisālī', *T'oung Pao*, 40, 1951, pp. 239–96.
- Demiéville, P., 'Le bouddhisme. Les sources chinoises', in L. Renou et J. Filliozat (et al.), *L'Inde classique*, II. Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1953, pp. 398–463.
- Giles, H. A. (tr.), *The Travels of Fa-hsien (399–414 A.D.), or Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1923.
- Kolmaš, J. (tr.), *Fa-sien. Zápis o buddhistických zemích*. Praha, Odcon, 1972 (see pp. 131–2 for a list of previous translations).
- Legge, James (tr.), *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1886.
- Nanjo, B., *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1883.
- Shih, R. (tr.), *Biographies des moines éminents* (Kao seng tchouan) de *Houei-kiao*. Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1968.

CHINESE CHARACTERS

- a. 羅摩
- b. 阿普尼達多
- c. 阿提目多
- d. 阿梨瑟吒
- e. 安伽陀
- f. 伊濕波羅
- g. 菩多羅提舍
- h. 遍那迦牟尼
- i. 尸梨沙
- j. 弥締羅
- k. 波吒利弗多羅
- l. 盧夷
- m. 波旬
- n. 育多伽
- o. 相應經
- p. 隨葉
- q. 阿濕卑
- r. 額鞞
- s. 善現
- t. 善自在

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY IN EARLY BUDDHISM

One of the main features of the early Indian civilization, repeatedly emphasized by scholars and also serving as a riddle for them for a long time, is the absence of any historical writings 'in the strict sense of the word'. There has been a general tendency to believe that the Indians had no history until the Greek historians taught them how to mark off historical periods by dates and to trace consequences to causes and so transform poetical and mythical accounts of the Indian past into histories. The lack of interest in handing down historical information is sometimes attributed to the ways of Hindu thinking, especially to the dominant theme of *nirvāna* which is said to advocate the unreality of the space-time bound empirical world. This argument, though it may be valid in the context of the early Hindu thought, cannot be used to explain the lack of interest in historiography in the earliest Buddhist tradition, for early Buddhism did not emphasize the unreality of the empirical world of space, time and causation.

Yet, the earliest historical literature in the Buddhist tradition, nay, even within the realm of South Asian culture, came into existence in Sri Lanka and goes back only to the fourth century A.D. which is the period during which the oldest extant Pali chronicle, the *Dīpavamśa*, assumed its present form.¹ During the next century the *Dīpavamśa* was followed by the more systematic chronicle, the *Mahāvamśa*. Heinz Bechert who examined the beginnings of Buddhist historiography has devoted himself to the task of 'searching for the motivation of the earliest historiographers instead of trying to explain the non-existence of an early Indian historical literature'.² In the following pages I propose to examine the reasons for the absence of historical records 'in the strict sense of the term' in the early Buddhist tradition, even though that tradition did not adopt the traditional Hindu outlook regarding the empirical world.

Although there is ample literary evidence to show that history was studied during the pre-Buddhist period as an independent discipline, at least in the Brahmanical schools, no one knows for